REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for granting and
participating in the Examiner's Interview of Oct. 12, 2005. Applicant re-presents the
arguments from the first response along with the additional arguments presented during
the interview and requests that the case be reopened. Applicant also acknowledges that an
IDS was submitted on Oct. 5. 2005 from a European Search Report in a corresponding
matter. Applicant provides herewith a copy of the European Search Report for the
Examiner's benefit. Applicant takes this opportunity to address the references that the
Applicant believes are more appropriate references than the Chow reference. Applicant
also wishes to acknowledge that claims 1,9,10 and 14 have been amended. These claims
have not been amended to overcome the Chow reference, but to make clear the implied
context of the claim wording.

Prior to addressing the specific rejections the Applicant wishes to differentiate
common terminology that is used within the cited prior art reference and the present
application. Although common words are shared between the Chow patent (6,226,693)
and the present claims, the meaning of the words is clearly different. Specifically, the
word "event" is used quite differently in both Chow and the present claims.

The reference of Chow is directed to handling events occurring in an environment
in a data processing system. The meaning of the word, event, is expressed at Col. 2 lines
36-39 which states:

> Two types of events exist: external (physical) and internal (logical). External
> events are generated by some physical device such as a mouse keyboard, touch
> screen, or the like. On the other hand, internal events are generated by some
> logic, such as a program or object.

Therefore, the word event as used in Chow refers to actions generated by a
programming object or trigger that has an effect on another programming object. The
generation of the event may be the result of a method being executed within another
object or some external stimulus, such as, a mouse click or depression of a keyboard.

6

Events in the present invention, as claimed, are not directed to a stimulus that triggers an action (See Fig. 3 of Chow), rather an event is an occurrence in the real world at a predetermined time (See Figs. 4 and 6 of the present application). Events occur relative to dates in a calendar as opposed to actions associated with objects that occur in a programming environment.

Although the word "event" is used in both Chow and the present application, the word has a different meaning and a different context. Similarly, the reference to Chow is directed to completely different subject matter from the present invention as claimed. As a result, the reference to Chow does not read on the present claims.

The present application includes claims directed to scheduling an event in a calendar of an invitee. A calendar contains an association between an occurrence/event and a fixed date and time. The prior art reference of Chow does not include any data structure that can be construed as a calendar. Col. 7 lines 45-62 of Chow disclose a hash table. The hash table associates, events, ID, and a link to a list of callback functions. The hash table is clearly not a calendar. The hash table does not have a schedule of events at fixed dates and times.

Applicant points out that as used in claim 1, an invitee is a user. The specification defines the term invitee at page 3 of the specification.

35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The analysis that is provided below is not deemed necessary, as it has already been shown that the present claims and the patent reference are unrelated. However, in the event that there is any doubt as to the disparity between the invention as presently claimed and the Chow reference, the provided analysis should make clear that the present claims are not anticipated by Chow.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chow et al. Claim 1 is directed to a method for scheduling an event over a network in a calendar of an invitee. The reference to Chow does not teach or describe a calendar of an invitee. Chow does not show a calendar that provides an association of dates. Chow teaches an event manager object that registers and handles events from programming objects in different environments.

7

The office action suggests that the claim limitation of "sending the schedule request to a server having access to the calendar of the invitee and a calendar of the event creator" is shown in Chow at col. 7 lines 45-63. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 7 lines 45-63 are associated with Fig. 6 of the Chow patent. Fig. 6 shows a Registry (Hash) Table. The table includes at least an Object ID, an associated Event, and a Pointer to a List. No calendar or reference to a calendar is shown either in Fig. 6 or in the accompanying text. Neither the table nor the columns of the table are associated with a calendar. Further still, the claim limitation requires that there are at least two calendars: the first belonging to the invitee and the second belonging to the event creator. The Chow reference does not teach or show separate calendars for an invitee and an event creator.

The office action also claims that the limitation of "creating an event record at the server, the event record including at least the set of details and a link to the calendar of the invitee; and adding the event to the invitee's calendar" is shown at col. 8, lines 33-46 of the Chow reference. Again, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the analysis. The passage from Chow describes the mapping of a platform specific event name to the logical event name. This passage does not refer to calendar of an invitee or to adding a link to the calendar of the invitee. As a result, this limitation is not taught or suggested by the reference of Chow.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for scheduling an event over a network. Applicant points out that the Chow patent does not schedule an event over a network. Chow is directed to events that occur on a personal computer (See Fig. 1).

Further, the Applicant wishes to point out that the server of the present invention as defined in claim 1 creates "an event record." The event record is separate entity from the calendar of the invitee. The server creates a link between the event record and the calendar of the invitee. The reference to Chow does not show a calendar and a separate event record wherein the event record has a link to the calendar. The Chow reference merely shows a hash table (look-up table) having a list of related identifiers, events, and pointers to callback functions.

Similar requirements can be found in independent claims 10 and 14. Both claims reference calendars of an invitee and of a creator. The reference to Chow is irrelevant to

8

the present claims, and therefore claims 1-18 are all allowable over the Chow reference.

IDS References

Applicant will now address the three IDS references (1. U.S. 5,960,406, 2. EP 1 1 22 672 A2, and 3. U.S. 6,064,977) recently submitted on Oct. 5, 2005. Also attached hereto is the European Search Report that prompted the IDS.

One of the closest references to the present invention is U.S. Patent 5,960,406 ('406 Patent). The '406 patent is directed to a system for scheduling events between end users of the system. In this system, each user has a calendar that is stored in a database at a central server. A user can send an invitation to others on the system. This invitation is sent via e-mail. A group record of the event is created at the central server and each party that accepts the invitation can view the group record see col. 10 lines 34-47, Fig. 2B and col. 13 lines 17-56. The '406 patent differs from the independent claims of the present application. In the '406 patent, the user sends an e-mail to invite invitees to an event, whereas in the independent claims, the event creator publishes a web page and a schedule request is created and sent to a server as the result of the invitee's action. Thus, in the '406 patent, a user sends out a request via-email, whereas in the presently claimed invention, the event creator publishes a web page and an invitee's actions causes the event to be added to the invitee's calendar.

European patent application EP 1 1 22 672 A2 is directed to a systems and methods for calendaring personal information. In this patent application, a user can create an event using an invitation template to invite others to an event. Once the user creates the invitation, the invitation is sent to a server, stored in a database, and sent via e-mail to the users. In general, the e-mail contains a link that when selected brings up a response page allowing the invitees to respond. If the invitees accept the invitation, the invitee may then add the event to their calendar see the Abstract and Col. 7 line 49 to Col. 8 line 11. In contrast, the independent claim 1 requires that the event creator publish an event on a web page and that the invitee causes a schedule request for scheduling the event in

9

the calendar of the invitee. Claim 1 also requires "creating an event record at the server" including "a link to the calendar of the invitee." A link to the calendar of the invitee is not created in EP 1 1 22 672 A2. The event creator creates an invitation that is stored in a database, but there is no link between the calendar of the invitee and an event record.

U.S. Patent 6,046,977 ('977 patent) is directed to a web server with integrated scheduling and calendaring. Users may invite other invitees to an event. The user performs this task by retrieving a form from a server, which serves as a template for creating an electronic mail message (e-mail). The e-mail is sent by the server to an invitee and if the invitee accepts, the server automatically schedules the event in the invitee's calendar. See col. 5 lines 7-29. As with the other references, this reference does not teach a web page published by an event creator listing an event. Further, the '977 patent does not teach a schedule request being created as the results of the user action on the web page published by the event creator. The '977 patent also differs from claim 1, in that an event record is not created at the server that includes the details of the event in addition to a link to the calendar of the invitee. In the '977 patent, the server merely updates the invitees calendar upon acceptance, but there is not a separate event record entity that includes a link to the invitee's calendar.

It is believed that all of the claim rejections have been addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

If any matter arises which may expedite issuance of a notice of allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned, at the telephone number given below.

It is believed that a two-month extension is required for this application. Please charge deposit account 19-4972 $450.00 for the extension. If any additional fees are required for the timely consideration of this application, please charge deposit account number 19-4972.

10

Respectfully submitted,

John J. Stickevers
Registration No. 39,387
Attorney for Applicant

BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston MA 02110-1618
Tel: 617 443 9292   Fax: 617 443 0004
02857/00106 436925.1

11

2280 HV Rijswijk (ZH)
℡ (070) 3 40 20 40
FAX (070) 3 40 30 16

| | Generaldirektion 1 | Directorate General 1 | Direction générale 1 |

Froud, Clive
7 Hurst Close
Tenterden
Ashford
Kent TN30 6UG
GRANDE BRETAGNE

DOCKETED

19 SEP 2005

RECEIVED

EPO Customer Services

Tel.: +31 (0)70 340 45 00

SEP 26 2005

BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN

Date
20.09.05

Reference	Application No./Patent No.
SKG/G22379EP	02734552.9 - 2221 PCT/US0216701

Applicant/Proprietor
Palm, Inc.

COMMUNICATION

The European Patent Office herewith transmits as an enclosure the supplementary European search report under Article 157(2)(a) EPC for the above-mentioned European patent application.

If applicable, copies of the documents cited in the European search report are attached.

☑ Additional set(s) of copies of the documents cited in the European search report is (are) enclosed as well.

Refund of the search fee

If applicable under Article 10 Rules relating to fees, a separate communication from the Receiving Section on the refund of the search fee will be sent later.

European Patent Office

SUPPLEMENTARY EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT

Application Number

EP 02 73 4552

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (Int.Cl.7)
X	US 6 064 977 A (HAVERSTOCK ET AL) 16 May 2000 (2000-05-16) * column 3, lines 29-55 - column 4, lines 3-14 * * column 5, lines 7-29,54-65 *	1-18	G06F17/60
X	US 5 960 406 A (RASANSKY ET AL) 28 September 1999 (1999-09-28) * column 5, lines 9-31 - column 8, lines 17-49 *	1-18	
P,X	EP 1 122 672 A (PALM INC) 8 August 2001 (2001-08-08) * abstract * * page 4, paragraph 21 - page 5, paragraphs 23,25 * * page 7, paragraph 44 - page 8, paragraphs 45,46 *	1-18	

TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (Int.Cl.7)

G06F

The supplementary search report has been based on the last set of claims valid and available at the start of the search.

2

Place of search	Date of completion of the search	Examiner
The Hague	13 September 2005	Thiam, M

CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS

X : particularly relevant if taken alone
Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category
A : technological background
O : non-written disclosure
P : intermediate document

T : theory or principle underlying the invention
E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date
D : document cited in the application
L : document cited for other reasons

& : member of the same patent family, corresponding document

EPO FORM 1503 03.82 (P04C04)

ANNEX TO THE EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT
ON EUROPEAN PATENT APPLICATION NO.

EP 02 73 4552

This annex lists the patent family members relating to the patent documents cited in the above-mentioned European search report.
The members are as contained in the European Patent Office EDP file on
The European Patent Office is in no way liable for these particulars which are merely given for the purpose of information.

13-09-2005

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)		Publication date
US 6064977	A	16-05-2000	NONE		
US 5960406	A	28-09-1999	AU	2239299 A	09-08-1999
			CN	1330784 A	09-01-2002
			EP	1049983 A1	08-11-2000
			JP	3294840 B2	24-06-2002
			JP	2002501249 T	15-01-2002
			JP	2002236789 A	23-08-2002
			WO	9938079 A1	29-07-1999
EP 1122672	A	08-08-2001	CA	2333803 A1	04-08-2001
			CN	1316703 A	10-10-2001

EPO FORM P0459

For more details about this annex : see Official Journal of the European Patent Office, No. 12/82